arXiv:1701.04841v2 [math.DS] 23 Mar 2017

NONLINEAR FOKKER-PLANCK EQUATIONS ON FINITE GRAPHS AND THEIR ASYMPTOTIC PROPERTIES

SHUI-NEE CHOW, WUCHEN LI, AND HAOMIN ZHOU

Abstract. The notion of Fokker-Planck equations on finite graphs developed in [10] is extended to account for the present of nonlinear interactive potentials in the free energy setting. We show that the solution of the Fokker-Planck equation converges to one of the Gibbs measures exponentially fast. And we give a new formula for the asymptotic dissipation rate. The continuous analog of this asymptotic rate is provided, which connects with Yano's formula [28, 29]. Several numerical examples are provided to illustrate the convergence behavior.

1. Introduction

Optimal transport theory has become one of the most active branches in mathematics in the past few decades, with many remarkable results revealing the deep connections among the theory of partial differential equations (PDEs), geometry and stochastic processes. For example, in the seminal work [15], Jordan, Kinderlehrer and Otto showed that the Fokker-Planck equation, a classical PDE describing the evolution of the probability density function for stochastic diffusion processes, is actually the gradient flow of a free energy in the probability space equipped with 2-Wasserstein metric. The results have profound impact and sparkled tremendous developments in the field [6, 7, 19, 23]. Much more can be found in the books by Villani [26, 27].

Motivated by applications in various fields such as game theory, RNA folding and numerical schemes for PDEs, similar matters have been studied in discrete settings, such as finite graphs, in recent years. It turns out that the optimal transport theory in discrete space is more subtle than a merely direct discretization of its counterpart in continuous space, due to reasons that might not be obvious at the first sight. On one hand, a graph with more than one node is not a length space [5], a crucial concept relied on by many important tools used in the optimal transport theory in continuous setting. Simple geodesics in the 2-Wasserstein space often do not exist if the underlying metric space is discrete [17]. On the other hand, graphs may have more complicated neighborhood structures that cannot be embedded into a continuous space, such as $\mathbb{R}^d$. That makes the discretization impossible.

Key words and phrases. Fokker-Planck equation; Optimal transport; Gradient flow; Graph; Dynamical system; Entropy dissipation; Yano's formula.

This work is partially supported by NSF Awards DMS–1419027, DMS-1620345, and ONR Award N000141310408.

Despite of the challenges, metrics that mimic the 2-Wasserstein distance in continuous space have been proposed for the probability spaces on discrete sets by several groups independently. In [17], Maas constructed a discrete Wasserstein metric, based on the properties of an irreducible and reversible Markov kernel on a finite set and Benamou-Brenier formula [3], and showed that the heat flow is gradient flow of the entropy with respect to the metric. In a study of the gradient flow of free energy on graphs, authors of [10] introduced a class of metrics on probability spaces on finite graphs that can be considered as an analogue of 2-Wasserstein metric, and then constructed the Fokker-Planck equations on graphs using the metrics. In the context of reaction-diffusion equations, a similar metric structure is also discovered in [20]. More recently, many studies related to the optimal transport theory in discrete settings and applications have been carried out. Readers are referred to [12, 13, 14, 18, 21, 22, 25] for more information.

Based on results developed in [10], the focus of this paper is on asymptotic properties of Fokker-Planck equations on graphs, especially when the free energy contains nonlinear interactive potentials, a case that has not been considered in discrete settings in the past. We shall show that the resulting nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations converge to one of the Gibbs distributions exponentially fast as time goes to infinity, which can be viewed as the discrete analogue of entropy dissipation [6, 11]. We further provide an explicit formula that bounds the convergence rate. It is worth to point out that there might be multiple equilibria (Gibbs measures) due to lack of convexity for general interactive potentials. This is a scenario that can cause technical difficulties for many existing methodologies. In contrast, to achieve the goal, we borrow strategies from dynamical systems to study the asymptotic behavior of the nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations. In addition, the deduced convergence rate formula seems to suggest, by formal calculations, an interesting continuous analog that connects to an important identity, known as Yano's formula, in Riemanian geometry [28, 29].

The structure of this paper is arranged as follows. We review the related results on discrete 2-Wasserstein metric and Fokker-Planck equations on graphs in the next section. Then study its asymptotic convergence in Section 3. In Section 4, we discuss some properties stemmed from the convergence rate formula, including an interesting connection with Yano's formula. We provide several numerical examples to illustrate the convergence properties in Section 5.

2. Optimal transport on finite graphs

In this section, we review the constructions of 2-Wasserstein metric in discrete states and Fokker-Planck equations on graphs. We mainly follow the approaches given in [10, 17]. To account for the nonlinear interactive potentials in free energy, our presentation might be different, although most results can be directly generalized from those ideas reported in cited references. For this reason, we skip some proofs if similar ones can be found there, unless the modifications are not trivial.

Let us consider a simple weighted finite graph $G = (V, E, d)$, where $V = \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$ is the vertex set, E is the edge set, and $d_{ij} \in d$ is the weight of edge $(i, j) \in E$ with $d_{ij} = d_{ji} > 0$. We assume that G is undirected and contains no self loops or multiple

edges. The adjacency set, or neighborhood, of vertex $i \in V$ is denoted by

$$N(i) = \{j \in V \mid (i,j) \in E\} \ .$$

The probability set (simplex) supported on all vertices of G is defined by

$$\mathcal{P}(G) = \{(p_i)_{i=1}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n p_i = 1 \ , \quad p_i \geq 0 \ , \quad \text{for any } i \in V\} \ ,$$

where p_i is the discrete probability function at node i. Its interior is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_o(G)$. To assist our presentation, we adopt the following notations and operations on G and $\mathcal{P}(G)$.

A **vector field** v on G refers to a *skew-symmetric matrix* on the edges set E:

$$v := (v_{ij})_{(i,j)\in E} \ , \quad \text{with} \quad v_{ij} = -v_{ji} \ .$$

Given a function $\Phi = (\Phi_i)_{i=1}^n$ on V, it induces a **potential vector field** $\nabla_G \Phi$ on G as

$$\nabla_G \Phi := (\frac{1}{d_{ij}}(\Phi_i - \Phi_j))_{(i,j)\in E} \ .$$

For a given probability function $p \in \mathcal{P}(G)$ and a vector field v, we define the product pv, called **flux function** on G, by

$$pv := (v_{ij} g_{ij}(p))_{(i,j)\in E} \ ,$$

where $g_{ij}(p)$ are specially chosen functions. For example, $g_{ij}(p)$ can be the logarithmic mean or an upwind function of p which are used in [10, 17]. In this paper, we select the average of p_i and p_j, i.e.

$$g_{ij}(p) = \frac{p_i + p_j}{2} \ , \quad \text{for any } (i,j) \in E \ ,$$

for the simplicity of illustration.

We define the **divergence** of pv on G by

$$\mathrm{div}_G(pv) := -\Big(\sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}} v_{ij} g_{ij}(p) \Big)_{i=1}^n \ ,$$

which returns a value at each node of V. Given two vector fields $v = (v_{ij})_{(i,j)\in E}$, $w = (w_{ij})_{(i,j)\in E}$ on a graph and $p \in \mathcal{P}(G)$. The discrete **inner product** is defined by,

$$(v,w)_p := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} v_{ij} w_{ij} g_{ij}(p) \ .$$

The coefficient $1/2$ in front of the summation accounts for the fact that every edge in G is counted twice. In particular, we have

$$(v,v)_p := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} v_{ij}^2 g_{ij}(p) \ .$$

It is worth to remark that we prefer not to replace g_{ij} by its explicit formula, as done in [10, 17], to emphasize the freedom of using different g_{ij}, which leads to different definitions for the flux function, divergence operator and inner product, and hence results in different formulas for the discrete 2-Wasserstein metric. More details are given in the Appendix.

Proposition: For any vector field v and potential function Φ on a graph, the following properties hold

(1) $-\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{div}_G(pv)|_i \Phi_i = (v, \nabla_G \Phi)_p$.

(2) $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{div}_G(pv)|_i = 0$.

Proof. Following the definitions and $v_{ij} + v_{ji} = 0$, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
-\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{div}_G(pv)|_i \Phi_i =& \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}} v_{ij} g_{ij} \Phi_i \\
=& \frac{1}{2}\Big(\sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}} v_{ij} \Phi_i g_{ij} + \sum_{(j,i)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}} v_{ji} \Phi_j g_{ji} \Big) \\
=& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} v_{ij} \frac{1}{d_{ij}} (\Phi_i - \Phi_j) g_{ij} \\
=& (\nabla_G \Phi, v)_p \ .
\end{aligned}$$

By taking $\Phi_i = 1$ for any $i \in V$, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{div}_G(pv)|_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{div}_G(pv)|_i \Phi_i = -(v, \nabla_G \Phi)_p = 0 \ .$$

□

The first identity in above proposition can be viewed as an analogue of integration by part formula on graphs.

2.1. **2-Wasserstein metric on a graph.** Following the approach in [17], we now present the discrete analogue of 2-Wasserstein metric $\mathcal{W}_2$ on probability set $\mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

Definition 1. *For any p^0, $p^1 \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$, define*

$$\mathcal{W}_2^2(p^0, p^1) := \inf_v \ \{ \int_0^1 (v, v)_p dt \ : \ \frac{dp}{dt} + div_G(pv) = 0 \ , \quad p(0) = p^0 \ , \quad p(1) = p^1 \} \ , \quad (1)$$

where the infimum is taken over all vector fields v on a graph, and p is a continuously differentiable curve $p : [0, 1] \to \mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

One can view the above definition as the discrete Briener-Benamou formula [3]. It has been proved in [10, 17] that $\mathcal{W}_2$ possesses properties that are similar to those for the 2-Wasserstein distance in the continuous space. For example, when equipped with $\mathcal{W}_2$, $\mathcal{P}_o(G)$ becomes a Riemannian manifold. In addition, Maas used the following decomposition on discrete sets in his study.

Theorem 2. *Given a vector field on a graph $v = (v_{ij})_{(i,j)\in E}$ with $v_{ij} = -v_{ji}$, and a measure $p \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$, there exists a unique decomposition, such that*

$$v = \nabla_G \Phi + u \ , \quad \textit{and} \quad div_G(pu) = 0 \ ,$$

where Φ is a function defined on V. In addition, the following property holds,

$$(v,v)_p = (\nabla_G\Phi, \nabla_G\Phi)_p + (u,u)_p \ .$$

One may view this decomposition as a discrete analogue of the well-known Hodge decomposition. Following the idea used in Maas [17], an equivalent definition of $\mathcal{W}_2$ is given in the next theorem.

Theorem 3. *If p^0, $p^1 \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$, then*

$$\big(\mathcal{W}_2(p^0,p^1)\big)^2 = \inf_{\nabla_G\Phi}\{\int_0^1 (\nabla_G\Phi, \nabla_G\Phi)_p dt \ : \ \frac{dp}{dt} + div_G(p\nabla_G\Phi) = 0 \ , \ p(0) = p^0 \ , \ p(1) = p^1\} \ , \tag{2}$$

where infimum is taken over all potential vector fields $\nabla_G\Phi$, and p is continuously differentiable curves $p : [0,1] \to \mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

Another equivalent definition, given in [10] independently, is to look at $\mathcal{W}_2$ from tangent space viewpoint. Consider the tangent space at a point $p \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$,

$$T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G) = \{(\sigma_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i = 0\} \ ,$$

it has been proved that for any given $\sigma \in T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G)$, there exists a unique function Φ, up to a constant shift, satisfying $\sigma = -\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)$, see details in [10]. This one to one map endows an inner product on $T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

Definition 4. *For any two tangent vectors $\sigma^1, \sigma^2 \in T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G)$, define the inner product $g : T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G) \times T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G) \to \mathbb{R}$ by*

$$g(\sigma^1,\sigma^2) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^1\Phi_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2\Phi_i^1 = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} g_{ij}(p)(\Phi_i^1 - \Phi_j^1)(\Phi_i^2 - \Phi_j^2) \ ,$$

where $\sigma^1 = -div_G(p\nabla_G\Phi^1)$ and $\sigma^2 = -div_G(p\nabla_G\Phi^2)$.

Hence (1) is equivalent to

$$\big(\mathcal{W}_2(p^0,p^1)\big)^2 = \inf\{\int_0^1 g(\sigma,\sigma)dt \ : \ \frac{dp}{dt} = \sigma \ , \quad p(0) = p^0 \ , \quad p(1) = p^1 \ , \quad p \in \mathcal{C}\} \ , \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{C}$ is the set of all continuously differentiable curves $p : [0,1] \to \mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

We use both definitions given in (2) or (3) in our investigation, depending on which one is more convenient for the discussion.

2.2. **Fokker-Planck equations on finite graphs.** We consider a discrete free energy $\mathcal{F} : \mathcal{P}(G) \to \mathbb{R}$ containing three terms: linear potential, interactive potential, and linear entropy given by

$$\mathcal{F}(p) = \sum_{i=1}^n V_i p_i + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n W_{ij}p_ip_j + \beta\sum_{i=1}^n p_i\log p_i \ , \tag{4}$$

where $(V_i)_{i=1}^n$ is a constant vector and $(W_{ij})_{1\le i,j\le n}$ is a symmetric matrix, and $\beta>0$ a small constant. Following approaches given in [10], we derive the gradient flow of $\mathcal{F}(p)$ on Riemannian manifold $(\mathcal{P}_o(G),\mathcal{W}_2)$.

Theorem 5 (Gradient flows)**.** *For a finite graph G and a constant $\beta>0$, the gradient flow of the discrete free energy $\mathcal{F}(p)$ defined in (4) on manifold $(\mathcal{P}_o(G),\mathcal{W}_2)$ is*

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt}=\sum_{j\in N(i)}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}g_{ij}(p)\big(\frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}\mathcal{F}(p)-\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\mathcal{F}(p)\big)\ . \tag{5}$$

For any initial condition $p^0\in\mathcal{P}_o(G)$, (5) has a unique solution $p(t):[0,\infty)\to\mathcal{P}_o(G)$. Moreover,

(i) *there exists a constant depending on p^0, $c=c(p^0)>0$, such that $p_i(t)\ge c$ for all $i\in V$ and $t>0$;*

(ii) *the free energy $\mathcal{F}(p)$ is a Lyapunov function for (5), i.e.*

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t))=-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}[\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\mathcal{F}(p)-\frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}\mathcal{F}(p)]^2g_{ij}(p)\le 0\ .$$

If $\lim_{t\to\infty}p(t)$ exists, denoted by p^∞, then p^∞ is one of the Gibbs measures.

Proof. For any $\sigma\in T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G)$, there exists Φ, such that $\sigma=-\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)$. Since $\frac{dp}{dt}=(\frac{dp_i}{dt})_{i=1}^n$, is in $T_p\mathcal{P}_o(G)$. By Definition 4, we have

$$(\frac{dp}{dt},\sigma)_p=\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{dp_i}{dt}\Phi_i\ . \tag{6}$$

On the hand side, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}\mathcal{F}(p)\cdot\sigma=&\sum_{i=1}^n\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\mathcal{F}(p)\cdot\sigma_i=-\sum_{i=1}^nF_i(p)\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)_i\\ =&(\nabla_GF(p),\nabla_G\Phi)_p=-\sum_{i=1}^n\Phi_i\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_GF(p))_i\ ,\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

in which we use short handed notation $F_i(p)=\frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\mathcal{F}(p)$, for any $i\in V$. Combining (6) and (7), and the definition of gradient flow on manifold, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}0=&(\frac{dp}{dt},\sigma)_p+\mathrm{d}\mathcal{F}(p)\cdot\sigma\\ =&\sum_{i=1}^n\{\frac{dp_i}{dt}-\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_GF(p))\}\Phi_i\ .\end{aligned}$$

Since the above formula is true for all $(\Phi_i)_{i=1}^n\in\mathbb{R}^n$,

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt}+\sum_{j\in N(i)}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}g_{ij}(p)\big(F_i(p)-F_j(p)\big)=0$$

holds for all $i\in V$, which is (5).

The proofs of (i) and (ii) are just slight modifications of [10], see more details in [16]. □

Different from the situations in [10, 17], the nonlinear Fokker-Planck equation (5) may have multiple Gibbs measures. We will give an example in Section 5. In this case, one can not construct a time reversible Markov process corresponding to (5). Therefore it does not fit into the framework of [17]. However, methodologies used in [10] can go through with nominal modifications.

3. Entropy dissipation on finite graphs

In this section, we study the asymptotic behavior of gradient flow (5). To further simplify our discussion, we introduce the following notations.

$$h_{ij,kl} = (\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_i \partial p_k} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_j \partial p_l} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_i \partial p_l} - \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_j \partial p_k})\mathcal{F}(p) \ , \quad \text{for any } i,\, j,\, k,\, l \in V \ ,$$

and

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p) = \min_{(\Phi_i)_{i=1}^n \in D} \frac{1}{4} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \sum_{(k,l)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2 d_{kl}^2} h_{ij,kl}(\Phi_i - \Phi_j) g_{ij} (\Phi_k - \Phi_l) g_{kl} \ , \tag{8}$$

where

$$D = \{(\Phi_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} (\Phi_i - \Phi_j)^2 g_{ij} = 1\} \ .$$

We assume that the initial measure p^0 is in a basin of attraction of equilibrium p^∞ for the gradient flow, meaning

$$(A) \quad \lim_{t\to\infty} p(t) = p^\infty \quad \text{and} \quad p^\infty \text{ is an isolated equilibrium.}$$

Now, we are ready to present the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 6. *Let (A) hold, $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty) > 0$. Then there exists a constant $C = C(p^0, G) > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty) \le e^{-Ct}(\mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \ . \tag{9}$$

Furthermore, for any sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ satisfying $(\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty) - \epsilon) > 0$, there exists a time $T > 0$ depending on ϵ and p^0, such that when $t > T$,

$$\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty) \le e^{-2(\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty)-\epsilon)(t-T)}(\mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \ .$$

Before giving the proof, we would like to comment that the quadratic formula involving $h_{ij,kl}$ in (8) relates to the Hessian operator of $\mathcal{F}(p)$, denoted as $\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathcal{W}_2}\mathcal{F}(p)$, at the **equilibrium** p^∞ with respect to 2-Wassertein metric $\mathcal{W}_2$ on $\mathcal{P}_o(G)$. This is different from the Hessian operator of $\mathcal{F}(p)$ with respect to the standard Euclidean metric on $\mathcal{P}_o(G)$, $\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{F}(p)$. We will discuss their connections in Subsection 3.2. In addition, $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty)$ is the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathcal{W}_2}\mathcal{F}(p)$ at p^∞.

3.1. **Proof of main results.** To prove this theorem, we borrow some techniques from dynamical systems. If the energy function $\mathcal{F}(p)$ is $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ convex at the equilibrium, meaning $\mathrm{Hess}\mathcal{F}(p)|_{p^\infty} \succeq \lambda_{\mathcal{F}} I$, where $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}} > 0$, then the following steps will show the results.

(1) Calculate the second order derivative of $\mathcal{F}(p(t))$ with respect to time t to get

Lemma 7.

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) \geq -\big(2\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p(t)) - m(p(t))\big)\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) \ ,$$

where $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined in (8) *and $m(p(t))$ is a function satisfying $\lim_{t\to\infty} m(p(t)) = 0$.*

(2) Apply $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$-convexity at p^∞ and Gronwall's inequality to show (9).

Proof of Lemma 7. From Theorem 5, the first order derivative of free energy along the gradient flow (5) gives

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i - F_j)^2 g_{ij} \ .$$

By the product rule, we compute the second order derivative,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) = \quad & -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i - F_j)^2 \frac{dg_{ij}}{dt} && \clubsuit \\ & -\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\Big(\frac{dF_i}{dt} - \frac{dF_j}{dt}\Big)(F_i - F_j) g_{ij} \ . && \spadesuit \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

We shall prove

$$\clubsuit \geq m(p(t))\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) \ , \tag{11}$$

with $\lim_{t\to\infty} m(p(t)) = 0$, and

$$\spadesuit \geq -2\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p(t))\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) \ . \tag{12}$$

Let us prove (11) first. Note

$$\begin{aligned}\clubsuit &= -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i - F_j)^2 \frac{d}{dt} g_{ij}(p(t)) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i - F_j)^2 \Big(\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_i}\frac{dp_i}{dt} + \frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_j}\frac{dp_j}{dt}\Big) \ .\end{aligned}$$

Since $\min\{p_i,p_j\}\le g_{ij}\le\max\{p_i,p_j\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_i}\frac{dp_i}{dt}+\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_j}\frac{dp_j}{dt}\le&2\max_{i\in V}|\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_i}|\cdot\max_{i\in V}|\frac{dp_i}{dt}|\\ =&2\max_{i\in V}|\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_i}|\cdot\max_{i\in V}|\sum_{j\in N(i)}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_j-F_i)g_{ij}|\\ \le&2\max_{i\in V}|\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_i}|\cdot\Delta(G)\cdot\max_{i\in V}p_i\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}|F_i-F_j|\\ \le&2\max_{i\in V}|\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_i}|\cdot\Delta(G)\cdot\frac{\max_{i\in V}p_i}{\min_{i\in V}p_i}\cdot g_{ij}\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}|F_i-F_j|\ .\end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta(G)$ is the maximal degree of graph G, meaning the largest number of edges incident to one vertex.

Defining

$$m(p(t))=2\cdot\max_{i\in V}|\frac{\partial g_{ij}}{\partial p_i}|\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}|F_i-F_j|\cdot\Delta(G)\cdot\frac{\max_{i\in V}p_i(t)}{\min_{i\in V}p_i(t)}\ , \tag{13}$$

we obtain

$$\clubsuit\ge-m(p(t))\cdot\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i-F_j)^2g_{ij}=m(p(t))\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t))\ .$$

From Theorem 5, we know that $\lim_{t\to0}|F_i(p(t))-F_j(p(t))|=0$ and $\inf_{t>0}\frac{\max_{i\in V}p_i(t)}{\min_{i\in V}p_i(t)}>0$, therefore

$$\lim_{t\to\infty}m(p(t))=0\ .$$

Next, we estimate $\spadesuit$ to prove (12). Denote $f_{ij}=\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_i\partial p_j}\mathcal{F}(p)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\spadesuit=&-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(\frac{dF_i}{dt}-\frac{dF_j}{dt})(F_i-F_j)g_{ij}\\ =&-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i-F_j)g_{ij}(\sum_{k=1}^n\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial p_k}\frac{dp_k}{dt}-\sum_{k=1}^n\frac{\partial F_j}{\partial p_k}\frac{dp_k}{dt})\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i-F_j)g_{ij}\sum_{k=1}^n(f_{ik}-f_{jk})(-\frac{dp_k}{dt})\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i-F_j)g_{ij}\sum_{k=1}^n(f_{ik}-f_{jk})[\sum_{l\in N(k)}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}]\\ =&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i-F_j)g_{ij}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{jk})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}\ .\end{aligned}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{jk})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}\\
=&\frac{1}{2}[\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{jk})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}+\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{jk})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}]\\
&\qquad\qquad\text{Relabel } k,\ l \text{ in the second formula.}\\
=&\frac{1}{2}[\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{jk})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}+\sum_{(l,k)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{lk}^2}(f_{il}-f_{jl})(F_l-F_k)g_{lk}]\\
=&\frac{1}{2}[\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{jk})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}-\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{il}-f_{jl})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}]\\
=&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}+f_{jl}-f_{jk}-f_{il})(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}\ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second last equality is from $g_{kl}=g_{lk}$ and $d_{kl}=d_{lk}$.

Combining above two steps, we have

$$\spadesuit=2\cdot\frac{1}{4}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2d_{kl}^2}h_{ij,kl}(F_i-F_j)g_{ij}(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}\ . \tag{14}$$

To prove (12), we need to show

$$\frac{1}{4}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2d_{kl}^2}h_{ij,kl}(F_i-F_j)g_{ij}(F_k-F_l)g_{kl}\geq\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p)\cdot\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i-F_j)^2g_{ij}\ . \tag{15}$$

The proof of (15) can be divided into two cases. Let

$$C(F):=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(F_i-F_j)^2g_{ij}\ .$$

If $C(F)=0$, then $F_i=F_j$ for any $(i,j)\in E$, which implies that both sides of (15) equal to 0, thus (15) holds.

If $C(F)>0$, we consider a vector field given by $(\frac{F_i}{\sqrt{C(F)}})_{i=1}^n\in D$. Substituting Φ_i in the definition of $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}$ by $\frac{F_i}{\sqrt{C(F)}}$, we obtain (15).

Using (11) and (12), we have

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(p(t))=\clubsuit+\spadesuit\geq-\big(2\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p(t))-m(p(t))\big)\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t))\ ,$$

which finishes the proof of Lemma 7. □

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 6. The main idea is to use the asymptotic comparison between $\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t))$ and $\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(p)$ in Lemma 7.

Proof of Theorem 6. If $p^0 = p^\infty$, the convergence result is trivial. So we only need consider the case when $p^0 \neq p^\infty$. From Theorem 5, we know that if $p^0 \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$, the solution of (5), $p(t)$, satisfies

$$m_0 = \min_{t\geq 0,\ i\in V} p_i(t) > 0 \ , \quad M_0 = \max_{t\geq 0,\ i\in V} p_i(t) < 1 \ .$$

And $p(t)$ converges to an equilibrium, i.e.

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} p(t) = p^\infty.$$

These imply the following two facts. First, since $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p)$ is a continuous function with respect to p, for $0 < \epsilon \ll \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty)$, there exists a time T_1, when $t > T_1$,

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p(t)) \geq \lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty) - \frac{\epsilon}{2} \ . \tag{16}$$

Second we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} \max_{(i,j)\in E} |F_i(p(t)) - F_j(p(t))| = 0$. For the given $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a time T_2, such that when $t > T_2$,

$$m(p(t)) < \epsilon \tag{17}$$

where $m(p(t))$ is defined in (13).

Let $T = \max\{T_1, T_2\}$, we shall discuss the convergence behavior of (5) in two different time intervals, $[T, \infty)$ and $[0, T]$, respectively.

(i) Consider $t \in [0, T]$. Denote

$$m_1 = \min_{0\leq t\leq T} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} |F_i(p(t)) - F_j(p(t))|^2 \ .$$

We claim that $m_1 > 0$. Assume this is not true, meaning $m_1 = 0$. Since $p(t)$ is continuous and $[0, T]$ is compact, there exists a time $T_0 \in [0, T]$, such that $\sum_{(i,j)\in E} |F_i(p(T_0)) - F_j(p(T_0))|^2 = 0$, which further implies $\frac{dp_i}{dt}|_{T_0} = 0$, for any $i \in V$ because of the Fokker-Planck equation (5). Hence the equilibrium of (5) is arrived at a finite time, which is impossible due to the uniqueness of the solution of ODEs.

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) =& -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} |F_i(p(t)) - F_j(p(t))|^2 g_{ij}(p(t)) \\
\leq& -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} |F_i(p(t)) - F_j(p(t))|^2 \cdot \min_{t\geq 0,\ i\in V} p_i(t) \\
\leq& -\min_{0\leq t\leq T_0} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} |F_i(p(t)) - F_j(p(t))|^2 \cdot \min_{t\geq 0,\ i\in V} p_i(t) \\
=& -m_0 m_1 \\
=& -\frac{m_0 m_1}{\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)} (\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \\
\leq& -\frac{m_0 m_1}{\mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)} (\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \ ,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is true since $\mathcal{F}(p(t))$ is decreasing along (5), i.e. $0 < \mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty) \leq \mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)$. Denote $C_1 = \frac{m_0 m_1}{\mathcal{F}(p^0)-\mathcal{F}(p^\infty)}$, then from the Gronwall's inequality on time interval $[0, t]$, we have

$$\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty) \leq e^{-C_1 t}(\mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \ .$$

(ii) Consider $t \in [T, \infty)$. From (16), (17) and Lemma 7,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) \geq & (2\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p(t)) - m(p(t)))\big(-\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t))\big) \\ \geq & 2(\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty) - \epsilon)\big(-\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t))\big) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where the second inequality holds since $-\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(t)) \geq 0$.

Denote $C_2 = 2(\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty) - \epsilon)$ and integrate (18) on $[t, \infty)$,

$$\int_t^\infty \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}\mathcal{F}(p(\tau))d\tau \geq -C_2 \int_t^\infty \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(p(\tau))d\tau \ ,$$

which is equivalent to

$$\frac{d}{dt}[\mathcal{F}(p^\infty) - \mathcal{F}(p(t))] \geq -C_2(\mathcal{F}(p^\infty) - \mathcal{F}(p(t))) \ ,$$

thus

$$\frac{d}{dt}[\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)] \leq -C_2(\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \ .$$

From the Gronwall's inequality on time interval $[T, t)$ with $t \geq T$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty) \leq & e^{-C_2(t-T)}(\mathcal{F}(p(T)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \\ \leq & e^{-C_2(t-T)}e^{-C_1 T}(\mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \\ \leq & e^{-\min\{C_1,C_2\}t}(\mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \ . \end{aligned}$$

Here the second inequality is from the estimation of (i) at $t = T$.

We finish the proof by combining (i), (ii) and letting $C = \min\{C_1, C_2\}$. □

3.2. **Analysis of dissipation rate.** In this sequel, we investigate the relationship between the quadratic formula containing $h_{ij,kl}$ in the definition of $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p)$ and $\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{F}(p) := (\frac{\partial^2}{\partial p_i \partial p_j}\mathcal{F}(p))_{1\leq i,j\leq n} \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$. Through this relationship, we prove several convergence results of nonlinear Fokker-Planck equations (5).

Lemma 8.

$$\frac{1}{4}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}h_{ij,kl}(\Phi_i - \Phi_j)g_{ij}(\Phi_k - \Phi_l)g_{kl} = \big(div_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)\big)^T Hess_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{F}(p)\big(div_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)\big) \ .$$

Proof. We shall use the discrete integration by parts formula given in Proposition in Section 2 twice to prove Lemma 8.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\big(\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)\big)^T \mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{F}(p)\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)\\
=&\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)|_i\big\{\sum_{k=1}^n f_{ik}\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)|_k\big\}\\
=&\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}\big\{\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}f_{ik}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\big\}\\
=&\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}\cdot\frac{1}{2}\cdot\{\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}f_{ik}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}+\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}f_{ik}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\text{Relabel } k \text{ and } l \text{ for the second formula}\\
=&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}\{\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}f_{ik}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}+\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{lk}^2}f_{il}(\Phi_l-\Phi_k)g_{lk}\}\\
=&\frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{il})(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\ .\\
=&\frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{1}{2}\cdot\{\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{il})(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\\
&\qquad+\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{il})(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\}\\
&\qquad\qquad\text{Relabel } i \text{ and } j \text{ for the second formula}\\
=&\frac{1}{2}\cdot\frac{1}{2}\cdot\{\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}-f_{il})(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\\
&\qquad-\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{jk}-f_{jl})(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\}\\
=&\frac{1}{4}\sum_{(i,j)\in E}\sum_{(k,l)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\frac{1}{d_{kl}^2}(f_{ik}+f_{jl}-f_{il}-f_{jk})(\Phi_i-\Phi_j)g_{ij}(\Phi_k-\Phi_l)g_{kl}\ ,
\end{aligned}
$$

which finishes the proof. □

Lemma 9. *If $Hess_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{F}(p)$ is positive definite at $p\in\mathcal{P}_o(G)$, then*

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p)>0\ .$$

In particular, $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p)>0$ if $\mathcal{H}(p)=\sum_{i=1}^n p_i\log p_i$ is the linear entropy and $p\in\mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

Proof. Using Lemma 8, $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p)$ in Definition 8 is equivalent to

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p)=\min_{\Phi\in D}\ \big(\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)\big)^T\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n}\mathcal{F}(p)\mathrm{div}_G(p\nabla_G\Phi)$$

where

$$D = \{(\Phi_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n \ : \ (\nabla_G \Phi, \nabla_G \Phi)_p = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} (\Phi_i - \Phi_j)^2 g_{ij} = 1\} \ .$$

Clearly, D is not a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^n$, since the vector $\Phi \in D$ can be unbounded. However, $\nabla_G \Phi$ remains the same for Φ adding with any constant. Thus one can easily show that

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p) = \min_{\Phi \in E} \big(\mathrm{div}_G(p \nabla_G \Phi)\big)^T \mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{F}(p) \mathrm{div}_G(p \nabla_G \Phi)$$

where

$$E = \{(\Phi_i)_{i=1}^{n-1} \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \mid \ (\nabla_G \Phi, \nabla_G \Phi)_p = 1 \ , \ \Phi_n = 0\} \ .$$

Fortunately, E is a compact set in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. The reason is as follows: Since E is closed, it is sufficient to show that E is bounded in $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. We know $\sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} (\Phi_i - \Phi_j)^2 g_{ij}(p) = 1$, then $\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} (\Phi_i - \Phi_j)^2 g_{ij}(p) \leq 1$, i.e.

$$|\Phi_i - \Phi_j| \leq \frac{d_{ij}}{\sqrt{g_{ij}(p)}} \leq \frac{\max_{(i,j)\in E} d_{ij}}{\sqrt{\min_{k\in V} p_k}} \ ,$$

where the inequality holds because $g_{ij}(p) = \frac{p_i + p_j}{2} \geq \min\{p_i, p_j\}$. As G is connected, there exists a finite sequence of edges that connect vertices i and n. In other words, there exist vertices $k_l \in V$, with $1 \leq l \leq m$, such that $k_1 = i$, $k_m = n$,

$$|\Phi_i| = |\Phi_i - \Phi_n| \leq \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} |\Phi_{k_{l+1}} - \Phi_{k_l}| \leq (m-1) \frac{\max_{(i,j)\in E} d_{ij}}{\sqrt{\min_{k\in V} p_k}} < \infty \ ,$$

where the first equality uses the fact $\Phi_n = 0$.

Assume $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p) = 0$, then there exists a function $\Phi^* \in E$, such that

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p) = \big(\mathrm{div}_G(p \nabla_G \Phi^*)\big)^T \mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{F}(p) \mathrm{div}_G(p \nabla_G \Phi^*) = 0 \ .$$

Since the matrix $\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{F}(p)$ is positive definite, we must have $\mathrm{div}_G(p \nabla_G \Phi^*) = 0$. Hence

$$(\nabla_G \Phi^*, \nabla_G \Phi^*)_p = -\sum_{i=1}^n \Phi_i^* \mathrm{div}_G(p \nabla_G \Phi^*)|_i = 0 \ ,$$

which contradicts $\Phi^* \in E$.

If the free energy contains only the linear entropy, its Hessian matrix $\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathcal{H} = \mathrm{diag}(\frac{1}{p_i})_{1\leq i\leq n}$ is clearly positive definite, then by the above statement, we know

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p) = \min_{\Phi} \{\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p_i} (\mathrm{div}_G(p \nabla_G \Phi)|_i)^2 \ : \ (\nabla_G \Phi, \nabla_G \Phi)_p = 1\} > 0 \ . \tag{19}$$

□

Corollary 10. *If the interaction matrix $(W_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$ is semi positive definite, then there is a unique Gibbs measure p^∞, which is the global attractor of (5). And there exists a constant $C > 0$, such that*

$$\mathcal{F}(p(t)) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty) \leq e^{-Ct} (\mathcal{F}(p^0) - \mathcal{F}(p^\infty)) \ .$$

Proof. Since $\mathcal{F}(p)$ is a strictly convex function, there exists a unique minimizer p^∞. Applying Lemma 9 at the equilibrium, we get $\lambda_{\mathcal{F}}(p^\infty) > 0$. From Theorem 6, we have the convergence result. □

To sum up, we witness a twofold **effect of linear entropy** for Fokker-Planck equations on graphs (5). On one hand, the linear entropy induces the boundary repeller property ($p(t)$ is always positive), which is the key property for the convergence results. On the other hand, the linear entropy adds "more" convexity to the energy function. This is crucial for the free energy containing only linear potential energy and linear entropy:

$$\mathcal{F}(p) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i p_i + \beta \mathcal{H}(p) \ . \tag{20}$$

In this case, it is natural (shown by Corollary 10) that the gradient flow of $\mathcal{F}(p)$ in (20) converges to its equilibrium exponentially fast, which agrees with the results in the continuous set up [19, 24].

Likewise, the convergence result of (20) implies many interesting functional inequalities on finite graphs. To illustrate, we present the modified Graph Log-Sobolev inequality (GLSI) here. Other types of inequalities, such as Talagrand or Poincare inequalities can be proved similarly, see [16] for details.

Given two discrete measures $\nu = (\nu_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$ and $\mu = (\mu_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathcal{P}(G)$, we consider two functions on $\mathcal{P}(G)$:

- Relative entropy (H):

$$\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) := \sum_{i=1}^{n} \mu_i \log \frac{\mu_i}{\nu_i} \ ;$$

- Relative Fisher information (I):

$$\mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2} (\log \frac{\mu_i}{\nu_i} - \log \frac{\mu_j}{\nu_j})^2 g_{ij}(\mu) \ .$$

Here we use the convention that $\mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu) = +\infty$ when $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G) \setminus \mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

Corollary 11. *For any finite simple weighted graph G and a positive measure $\nu \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$, there exists a constant $\lambda > 0$, such that the modified Graph Log-Sobolev inequality holds:*

$$\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) \le \frac{1}{2\lambda} \mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu) \quad (GLSI) \ .$$

Furthermore, for a sufficient small $\epsilon > 0$, there exists an open set D_1 containing ν, such that if $\mu \in D_1$, GLSI holds for $\lambda = \lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) - \epsilon$.

Remark 1. Similar inequalities have been given by Mass and Erbar [12], in which they proved the GLSI for graphs satisfying certain conditions (positive "Ricci curvature" with a lower bound). In contrast, Corollary 11 demonstrates that the GLSI holds for **any finite graphs**. However, we note that the bound λ here is in an asymptotic sense, which is not sharper than the one in [12].

Proof. We prove GLSI via Fokker-Planck equation (5). Observing that

$$\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \log \mu_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \log \nu_i$$

is a summation of entropy and linear potential energy, which has a unique minimizer ν, we construct the Fokker-Planck equation for $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)$ with respect to the discrete 2-Wasserstein metric,

$$\frac{d\mu_i}{dt} = \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(\log\frac{\mu_j}{\nu_j} - \log\frac{\mu_i}{\nu_i})g_{ij}(\mu) \ . \tag{21}$$

Along (21), the dissipation of relative entropy is the relative Fisher information (Theorem 5 (ii))

$$\mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu(t)) = -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t)) \ . \tag{22}$$

To prove GLSI, we divide $\mathcal{P}(G)$ into two regions, and show that there exists an upper bound for $\frac{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)}{\mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu)}$ in each of the regions.

The division requires the following result: Given a constant $0 < \epsilon < \lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu)$, there exists a constant $\delta > 0$, such that

$$\text{if } \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) < \delta \text{ and } \mu \in \mathcal{P}_o(G) \text{ , then } \lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\mu) - m(\mu) > \lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) - \epsilon \ , \tag{23}$$

where $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) > 0$ is from Lemma 9, $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\mu) = \lambda_{\mathcal{H}_\nu}(\mu)$ is by (8), and the function $m(\cdot)$ is defined in (13), i.e.

$$m(\mu) = 2\cdot\max_{i\in V}|\frac{\partial g_{ij}(\mu)}{\partial \mu_i}|\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}\frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}\cdot\max_{(i,j)\in E}|\log\frac{\mu_j}{\nu_j} - \log\frac{\mu_i}{\nu_i}|\cdot\Delta(G)\cdot\frac{\max_{i\in V}\mu_i}{\min_{i\in V}\mu_i} \ .$$

Since $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) \in C^2$ when $\mu \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$, we can apply the Taylor expansion of $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)$ at $\mu = \nu$:

$$\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) = \mathcal{H}_\nu(\nu) + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\nu}{\partial \mu_i}(\nu)(\mu_i - \nu_i) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}_\nu}{\partial \mu_i \partial \mu_j}(\bar{\mu})(\mu_i - \nu_i)(\mu_j - \nu_j) \ ,$$

where $\bar{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)$. Since $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\nu) = 0$, $\frac{\partial \mathcal{H}_\nu}{\partial \mu_i}(\nu) = 1$ and $\big(\frac{\partial^2 \mathcal{H}_\nu}{\partial \mu_i \partial \mu_j}(\bar{\mu})\big)_{1\le i\le j\le n} = \text{diag}(\frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_i})_{1\le i\le n}$, then

$$\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_i}(\mu_i - \nu_i)^2 \ge \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_i - \nu_i)^2 \ ,$$

where the inequality is from $\frac{1}{\bar{\mu}_i} \ge 1$. Thus a sufficient small $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)$ implies that μ is close to ν in 2 norm. Since $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\mu)$, $m(\mu)$ are continuous functions with respect to μ, and $m(\nu) = 0$, we prove (23).

For the selected δ, we are ready to present the division

$$\mathcal{P}(G) = D_1 \cup (\mathcal{P}(G) \setminus D_1) \ ,$$

where

$$D_1 = \{\mu \in \mathcal{P}_o(G) \ : \ \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu) < \delta\} \ .$$

On one hand, when $\mu \in D_1$, we use the gradient flow (21), with $\mu(t)$ starting at initial measure μ, to prove the inequality. Since $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)$ is a Lyapunov function, we know $\mu(t) \in D_1$ for all $t > 0$. From (23), the proof in Theorem 6 and Lemma 7, we have

$$\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t)) \geq 2(\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\mu(t)) - m(\mu(t)))\big(-\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t))\big) \geq 2(\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) - \epsilon)\big(-\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t))\big) \ ,$$

which further implies

$$\int_t^\infty \frac{d^2}{d\tau^2}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(\tau))d\tau \geq \int_t^\infty -2(\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) - \epsilon)\frac{d}{d\tau}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(\tau))d\tau \ .$$

i.e.

$$\frac{d}{d\tau}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(\tau))|_{\tau=t}^{\tau=\infty} \geq 2(\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) - \epsilon) \cdot \big(\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(\tau))|_{\tau=\infty}^{\tau=t}\big) \ ,$$

Since $\lim_{t\to\infty} \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t)) = \lim_{t\to\infty} \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t)) = 0$, the above formula shows

$$\mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu(t)) = -\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t)) \geq 2(\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) - \epsilon)\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu(t)) \ ,$$

where the first equality is from (22). Thus from $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) > \epsilon > 0$, we have

$$\lambda_1 = \sup_{\mu\in D_1} \frac{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)}{\mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu)} \leq \frac{1}{2(\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(\nu) - \epsilon)} < \infty \ .$$

On the other hand, when $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(G) \setminus D_1$, we shall show

$$\lambda_2 = \sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(G)\setminus D_1} \frac{\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)}{\mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu)} \leq \frac{\sup_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(G)\setminus D_1} \mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)}{\inf_{\mu\in\mathcal{P}(G)\setminus D_1} \mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu)} < \infty \ .$$

It is trivial that $\mathcal{H}_\nu(\mu)$ is bounded above. We only need to show $\inf_{\mathcal{P}(G)\setminus D_1} \mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu) > 0$. Assume this is not true, i.e. $\inf_{\mathcal{P}(G)\setminus D_1} \mathcal{I}_\nu(\mu) = 0$. Since $\mathcal{I}_\nu$ is a lower semi continuous function and $\mathcal{P}(G) \setminus D_1$ is a compact set (D_1 is an open set), there exists $p^* \in \mathcal{P}(G) \setminus D_1$, such that

$$\mathcal{I}_\nu(p^*) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{(i,j)\in E} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(\log\frac{p_i^*}{\nu_i} - \log\frac{p_j^*}{\nu_j})^2 g_{ij}(p^*) = 0 \ .$$

It implies $\frac{p_i^*}{\nu_i} = \frac{p_j^*}{\nu_j}$ for any $(i,j) \in E$. Since G is connected and $p^* \in \mathcal{P}(G)$, we must have $p^* = \nu \in D_1$, which contradicts with $p^* \in \mathcal{P}(G) \setminus D_1$. By taking $\frac{1}{2\lambda} = \max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$, we prove GLSI. □

4. Hessian of free energy at equilibrium and its continuous analog

In this section, we exploit the meaning of $h_{ij,kl}$ by examining its continuous analog. Our calculation indicates a nice connection to a famous identity in Riemannian geometry, known as Yano's formula [28, 29]. Here, we would like to state that the derivations in this section are formal, and we do not address many important issues, such as regularities, of the terms involved.

Let us consider a smooth finite (d) dimensional Riemannian manifold $\mathcal{M}$. We assume that $\mathcal{M}$ is oriented, compact and has no boundary. We denote $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ the space of density functions supported on $\mathcal{M}$, $T_\rho\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ the tangent space at $\rho \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, i.e. $T_\rho\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}) =$

$\{\sigma(x) \ : \ \int_{\mathcal{M}} \sigma(x)dx = 0\}$. Following Otto calculus in [24, 27], for any $\sigma(x) \in T_\rho \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$, there exists a function $\Phi(x)$ satisfying $\sigma(x) = -\nabla \cdot (\rho \nabla \Phi(x))$. This correspondence and the 2-Wasserstein metric endow an scalar inner production on $T_\rho \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$

$$(\sigma(x), \tilde{\sigma}(x)) = (\nabla\Phi, \nabla\tilde{\Phi})_\rho := \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla\Phi \cdot \nabla\tilde{\Phi} \rho dx \ .$$

Now consider a smooth free energy $\mathcal{F} : \ \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M}) \to \mathbb{R}$. We assume that $\rho^* \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{M})$ is an equilibrium satisfying

$$\rho^*(x) > 0 \ , \quad \nabla \frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)} \mathcal{F}(\rho)|_{\rho^*} = 0 \ , \tag{24}$$

where $\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)}$ is the first variation operator in L_2 metric.

To understand $h_{ij,kl}$, we mimic Lemma 8 in the continuous case. More precisely, we want to calculate the Hessian of $\mathcal{F}$ at ρ^* with respect to the 2-Wasserstein metric, and show

$$(\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathcal{W}_2}\mathcal{F} \cdot \nabla\Phi, \nabla\Phi)_{\rho^*} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \int_{\mathcal{M}} (\mathrm{D}_x \mathrm{D}_y \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\rho(x)\delta\rho(y)} \mathcal{F}(\rho)|_{\rho^*} \nabla\Phi(x), \nabla\Phi(y)) \rho^*(x)\rho^*(y) dxdy \ , \tag{25}$$

where $\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\rho(x)\delta\rho(y)}\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ is the second variation of functional $\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ in L_2 metric, D_x and D_y are the covariant derivatives in x and y respectively, and Φ an arbitrary smooth function.

A formal derivation: It is known that Hessian can be computed by differentiating the function twice along the geodesic. Then the Hessian at the equilibrium ρ^* satisfies

$$(\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathcal{W}_2}\mathcal{F} \cdot \nabla\Phi, \nabla\Phi)_\rho = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \mathcal{F}(\rho_t)|_{t=0} \ .$$

where ρ_t and $\nabla\Phi_t$ are time dependent functions satisfying the geodesic equation [24, 27],

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial t} + \nabla \cdot (\rho_t \nabla \Phi_t) = 0 \\ \frac{\partial \Phi_t}{\partial t} + \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\Phi_t)^2 = 0 \end{cases} ,$$

with an initial measure $\rho|_{t=0} = \rho^*$ and velocity $\nabla\Phi_t|_{t=0} = \nabla\Phi$. Following the geodesic, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t) &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)} \mathcal{F}(\rho_t) \frac{\partial \rho_t}{\partial t} dx = -\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)} \mathcal{F}(\rho_t) \nabla \cdot (\rho_t \nabla\Phi_t) dx \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla \frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)} \mathcal{F}(\rho_t) \cdot \nabla\Phi_t(x) \rho_t(x) dx \ , \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where the third equality holds by the integration by parts formula and the fact that $\mathcal{M}$ has no boundary.

By the product rule on (26), we obtain the second order derivative along the geodesic,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t) = &\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{dt} [\nabla \frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)} \mathcal{F}(\rho_t)] \cdot \nabla\Phi_t(x) \rho_t(x) dx & (A_1) \\ &+ \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla \frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)} \mathcal{F}(\rho_t) \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial t} (\nabla\Phi_t(x) \rho_t(x)) dx \ . & (A_2) \end{aligned}$$

Because $\rho|_{t=0} = \rho^*$ and (24) holds, $(A_2)|_{t=0} = 0$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)|_{t=0} =&(A_1)|_{t=0} = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{dt}[\nabla \frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)]|_{t=0} \cdot \nabla\Phi(x)\rho(x)dx \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \nabla \frac{d}{dt}\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)|_{t=0} \cdot \nabla\Phi(x)\rho(x)dx \\ &= -\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{d}{dt}\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)|_{t=0} \nabla\cdot(\nabla\Phi(x)\rho(x))dx \ .\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

In addition, we compute the first order derivative of $\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)}\mathcal{F}(\rho)$ along the geodesic, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\frac{\delta}{\delta\rho(x)}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)|_{t=0} &= \int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\rho(x)\delta\rho(y)}\mathcal{F}(\rho)\frac{\partial\rho(t,y)}{\partial t}|_{t=0}dy \\ &= -\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\rho(x)\delta\rho(y)}\mathcal{F}(\rho)\nabla\cdot(\nabla\Phi(y)\rho(y))dy \ .\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Substituting (28) into (27), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d^2}{dt^2}\mathcal{F}(\rho_t)|_{t=0} &= \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\rho(x)\delta\rho(y)}\mathcal{F}(\rho)|_{\rho^*}\nabla\cdot(\rho^*(x)\nabla\Phi(x))\nabla\cdot(\rho^*(y)\nabla\Phi(y))dxdy \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{M}}\int_{\mathcal{M}} (D_xD_y\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\rho(x)\delta\rho(y)}\mathcal{F}(\rho)|_{\rho^*}\nabla\Phi(x),\nabla\Phi(y))\rho^*(x)\rho^*(y)dxdy \ ,\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where the second equality is achieved by the integration by parts with respect to x and y. Hence, we obtain (25).

Through (25), we find the continuous analogue of $h_{ij,kl}$ as

$$\mathrm{D}_x\mathrm{D}_y\frac{\delta^2}{\delta\rho(x)\delta\rho(y)}\mathcal{F}(\rho)$$

In addition, Lemma 8 is the discrete analog of the second equality in (29).

We next illustrate this analog in a particular situation, namely the linear entropy

$$\mathcal{H}(\rho) = \int_{\mathcal{M}} \rho(x)\log\rho(x)dx \ .$$

In this case, the unique equilibrium (minimizer) $\rho^*(x) = 1$ is a uniform measure on $\mathcal{M}$, where the total volume of $\mathcal{M}$ is assumed to be 1. Hence (29) becomes,

$$(\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathcal{W}_2}\mathcal{H}\cdot\nabla\Phi,\nabla\Phi)_{\rho^*} = \int_{\mathcal{M}}[\nabla\cdot(\rho^*\nabla\Phi(x))]^2\frac{1}{\rho^*(x)}dx = \int_{\mathcal{M}}[\nabla\cdot(\nabla\Phi(x))]^2dx \ . \tag{30}$$

The optimal transport theory [24, 27] gives another formulation of Hessian:

$$(\mathrm{Hess}_{\mathcal{W}_2}\mathcal{H}\cdot\nabla\Phi,\nabla\Phi)_{\rho} = \int_{\mathcal{M}}[\mathrm{Ric}(\nabla\Phi(x),\nabla\Phi(x)) + \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{D}^2\Phi(x)\mathrm{D}^2\Phi(x)^T)]\rho(x)dx \ , \tag{31}$$

where ρ is an arbitrary density function, D^2 is the second covariant derivative and Ric is the Ricci curvature tensor on $\mathcal{M}$. Evaluating (31) at the equilibrium ρ^* and comparing it with (30), we observe

$$\int_{\mathcal{M}}[\nabla\cdot(\nabla\Phi)]^2dx = \int_{\mathcal{M}}[\mathrm{Ric}(\nabla\Phi,\nabla\Phi) + \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{D}^2\Phi\mathrm{D}^2\Phi^T)]dx \ .$$

Interestingly, this is the well-known Yano's formula with vector field $\nabla\Phi$.

5. Examples

In this section, we illustrate the convergence properties of (5) by several numerical experiments. Our first example is to show that there can exist multiple Gibbs measures. Consider a lattice graph with three vertices:



and the probability set

$$\mathcal{P}(G) = \{(p_i)_{i=1}^3 \ : \ \sum_{i=1}^3 p_i = 1 \ , \quad p_i \geq 0\} \ ,$$

with a free energy

$$\mathcal{F}(p) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^3\sum_{j=1}^3 W_{ij}p_ip_j + \beta\sum_{i=1}^3 p_i\log p_i \ ,$$

We compute the minimizer of $\mathcal{F}(p)$ by (5), with $\beta = 0.1$ and a non-convex interaction matrix

$$(W_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq 3} = -\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

With different initial conditions, we found two minimizers (Gibbs measures) of the free energy, see Figure 1.

Figure 1. Plot of two Gibbs measures: one is $(0.0001, 0.4729, 0.5270)$, the other is $(0.9986, 0.0007, 0.0007)$.

Next, we examine the relationship among entropy, convergence rate of (5), and graph structure. It is easy to check if the free energy $\mathcal{F}(p)$ only contains entropy $\mathcal{H}(p)$, the gradient flow becomes,

$$\frac{dp_i}{dt} = \sum_{j\in N(i)} \frac{1}{d_{ij}^2}(\log p_j - \log p_i)g_{ij} \ . \tag{32}$$

For convenience, we let $d_{ij} = 1$ for any $(i,j) \in E$ in our computations. Obviously, there is a unique minimizer, the Gibbs measure, $p^\infty = (\frac{1}{n}, \cdots, \frac{1}{n})$. To estimate the convergence

rate, we calculate the quantity $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty)$ numerically, by the following approximation,

$$\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx \frac{1}{2} \min_{p^0 \in \mathcal{P}_o(G)} \log \frac{\mathcal{H}(p(T)) - \mathcal{H}(p^\infty)}{\mathcal{H}(p(T+1)) - \mathcal{H}(p^\infty)} \ .$$

where T is a chosen large enough time and $p(T)$, $p(T+1)$ is the solution of (32) with initial condition p^0 at time T, $T+1$ respectively. This approximation is motivated by the asymptotic convergence results in Theorem 6, where $e^{-2\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty)}$ gives the upper bound of $\frac{\mathcal{H}(p(T+1))-\mathcal{H}(p^\infty)}{\mathcal{H}(p(T))-\mathcal{H}(p^\infty)}$.

Intuitively, $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty)$ describes how fast the gradient flow (32) approaches the equilibrium, and it can be viewed as an indicator for the diffusion speed of the graph. The smaller the value of $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty)$, the slower the diffusion process on the graph.

We demonstrate two cases by changing of graph structure, namely adding or deleting certain edges, and show its affects on the asymptotical convergence rate.

Case 1: we consider a two 6 vertices cycle graph connected by one edge.



$\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx 0.1580.$

By removing an edge at different locations, we obtain three different graphs and their rates showing in the following plots.



(A) $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx 0.0918.$



(B) $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx 0.1164.$



(C) $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx 0.1516.$

The rates corresponding to the graphs (A), (B), and (C) clearly indicates diffusion properties of the three graphs respectively.

Case 2: we consider two spherical type graph connected by one edge.



$\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx 0.2426.$

By deleting one edge at different locations, we obtain two different graphs and two different rates.



(D) $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx 0.2276.$



(E) $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty) \approx 0.2406.$

In this case, the values of $\lambda_{\mathcal{H}}(p^\infty)$ remain similar despite of the difference in graph structures. It indicates that graphs, (D), (E) and the original one, have similar diffusion properties.

Appendix

As we mentioned in Section 2, one has the freedom to select different g_{ij} in the definition of flux function on a graph, as long as the selection satisfies certain properties. In our study of the gradient flow on graphs, we generally require g_{ij} to satisfy the following three conditions:

(i)
$$\min\{p_i, p_j\} \leq g_{ij}(p) \leq \max\{p_i, p_j\} \ ;$$

(ii)
$$g_{ij}(p) = g_{ji}(p) \ ;$$

(iii)
$$\text{if } p_i = 0 \text{ or } p_j = 0 \ , \quad \text{then} \quad g_{ij}(p) = 0 \ .$$

Here (i), (ii) guarantees that the derived equation is a dissipate system, and (iii) is used to ensure the gradient flow is well defined on the boundary of probability set. For the case of Fokker-Planck equations on graphs, one can simply withdraw condition (iii). Because the entropy makes the boundary of probability as a repeller. Thus (5) is always a well defined initial value ODE in $\mathcal{P}_o(G)$.

We would like to mention that a similar discussion on the selection of g_{ij} has been given by Maas in [17] under a different framework. In his setting, there are 8 requirements including the three we listed here.

In practice, for different modeling or computational purposes, there are many choices of g_{ij} other than the simple average used in this paper. For example, up-wind type

$$g_{ij}(p) := \begin{cases} p_i & \text{if } \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\mathcal{F}(p) > \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}\mathcal{F}(p) \ , \ j \in N(i) \ ; \\ p_j & \text{if } \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\mathcal{F}(p) < \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}\mathcal{F}(p) \ , \ j \in N(i) \ ; \\ \frac{p_i+p_j}{2} & \text{if } \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i}\mathcal{F}(p) = \frac{\partial}{\partial p_j}\mathcal{F}(p) \ , \ j \in N(i) \ ; \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

Logarithm mean type

$$g_{ij}(p) := \frac{p_i - p_j}{\log p_i - \log p_j} \ ,$$

and Harmonic mean type

$$g_{ij}(p) = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{p_i} + \frac{1}{p_j}}$$

have been used by different groups in various context in the literature. The convergence properties developed in this paper still hold with these selections.

Acknowledgement: The proof of convergence rate is based on Wuchen Li's thesis in Chapter 3, which was written under the supervision of Professor Shui-Nee Chow and Professor Haomin Zhou. We would like to thank Professor Wilfrid Gangbo for many fruitful and inspirational discussions on the related topics.

References

[1] Luigi Ambrosio. *Lecture notes on optimal transport problems*. Springer, 2003.

[2] Luigi Ambrosio, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[3] Jean-David Benamou and Yann Brenier. A computational fluid mechanics solution to the Monge-Kantorovich mass transfer problem. *Numerische Mathematik*, 84(3): 375–393

[4] Dario Benedetto, Emanuelle Caglioti, José A Carrillo, and Mario Pulvirenti. A non-Maxwellian steady distribution for one-dimensional granular media. *Journal of statistical physics*, 91(5-6):979–990, 1998.

[5] Anca-Iuliana Bonciocat and Karl-Theodor Sturm. Mass transportation and rough curvature bounds for discrete spaces, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 256 (9): 2944–2966, 2009.

[6] José A Carrillo, Robert J McCann and Cédric Villani. Kinetic equilibration rates for granular media and related equations: entropy dissipation and mass transportation estimates. *Revista Matematica Iberoamericana*, 19(3):971–1018, 2003.

[7] Eric Carlen and Wilfrid Gangbo. Constrained steepest descent in the 2-Wasserstein metric. *Annals of mathematics*, 807–846, 2003.

[8] Shui-Nee Chow, Luca Dieci, Wuchen Li and Haomin Zhou. Entropy dissipation semi schemes for Fokker-Planck equations. *arXiv:1608.02628, 2016.*

[9] Shui-Nee Chow, Wen Huang, Yao Li and Haomin Zhou. A Free Energy Based Mathematical Study for Molecular Motors. *Regular and Chaotic Dynamic*, 16 (1-2), 2011.

[10] Shui-Nee Chow, Wen Huang, Yao Li and Haomin Zhou. Fokker-Planck equations for a free energy functional or Markov process on a graph. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 203(3):969–1008, 2012.

[11] Laurent Desvillettes and Cédric Villani. Entropic methods for the study of the long time behavior of kinetic equations. *Transport Theory and Statistical Physics*, pages 155–168, 2001.

[12] Matthias Erbar and Jan Maas. Ricci curvature of finite Markov chains via convexity of the entropy. *Archive for Rational Mechanics and Analysis*, 206(3): 997–1038, 2012.

[13] Matthias Erbar and Jan Maas. Gradient flow structures for discrete porous medium equations. *arXiv:1212.1129*, 2012.

[14] Max Fathi and Jan Maas. Entropic Ricci curvature bounds for discrete interacting systems, arXiv:1501.00562, 2016.
[15] Richard Jordan, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. The variational formulation of the Fokker-Planck equation. *SIAM journal on mathematical analysis*, 29(1):1–17, 1998.
[16] Wuchen Li. A study of stochastic differential equations and Fokker-Planck equations with applications. *Phd thesis*, 2016.
[17] Jan Maas. Gradient flows of the entropy for finite Markov chains. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 261(8):2250–2292, 2011.
[18] Jan Maas and Daniel Matthes. Long-time behavior of a finite volume discretization for a fourth order diffusion equation, arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.03178, 2015.
[19] Peter A Markowich and Cédric Villani. On the trend to equilibrium for the Fokker-Planck equation: an interplay between physics and functional analysis. *Mat. Contemp*, pages 1–29, 2000.
[20] Alexander Mielke. A gradient structure for reactiondiffusion systems and for energy-drift-diffusion systems. *Dedicated to Herbert Gajewski on the occasion of his 70th birthday. Nonlinearity.* 24(4): 13–29, 2011.
[21] Alexander Mielke. Geodesic convexity of the relative entropy in reversible Markov chains. *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations*, 48(1-2):1–31, 2013.
[22] Yann Ollivier. Ricci curvature of Markov chains on metric spaces. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 256(3):810–864, 2009.
[23] Felix Otto. The geometry of dissipative evolution equations: the porous medium equation. *Communications in Partial Differential Equations*, 26(1-2), 2001.
[24] Felix Otto and Cédric Villani. Generalization of an inequality by Talagrand and links with the logarithmic Sobolev inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis* 173 (2): 361–400, 2000.
[25] Justin Solomon, Raif Rustamov, Leonidas Guibas, Adrian Butscher. Continuous-Flow Graph Transportation Distances. *arxiv.org/abs/1603.06927*, 2016.
[26] Cédric Villani. *Topics in Optimal transportation*. Number 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2003.
[27] Cédric Villani. *Optimal transport: old and new*. Volume 338. Springer Science & Business Media, 2008.
[28] Kentaro Yano. Some remarks on tensor fields and curvature. *Annals of Mathematics*, pages 328–347, 1952.
[29] Kentaro Yano. Some integral formulas and their applications. *The Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 5(1): 63–73, 1958.

School of Mathematics, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332 U.S.A.

E-mail address: chow@math.gatech.edu

E-mail address: wcli@math.ucla.edu

Department of Mathematics, UCLA, Los Angeles, CA 90095.

E-mail address: haomin.zhou@math.gatech.edu